

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 22, 2003. Claims 1-12 remain in this application. Claims 1, 3, 7 and 11 are the independent Claims. It is believed that no new matter is involved in the arguments presented herein. Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are respectfully requested.

Art-Based Rejections

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0031631 A1 (Pitts).

The Pitts Reference

Pitts is directed to personal communication devices such as portable phones and pagers. (*See, Pitts, abstract; [0001]*). According to Pitts, a base (pico) station determines that a mobile phone is within its given area and queries the phone whether it is equipped with the disclosed system for silent communications. The answer, or lack of it, is noted in the information kept for each active phone in the system. Phones which are equipped for silent operation are commanded to go into silent mode. (*See Pitts [0045]; FIG. 1A*). When an incoming call is received for a particular phone, the stored information is checked to see if this phone is equipped to operate in a silent mode. If the answer is "no", the call will NOT be forwarded to the user, but will be handled as if the user did not answer the phone. (*See, Pitts, [0046]*). If the phone is equipped to operate in silent mode, the pico-station notifies the phone of the incoming call and the phone, which has been commanded to operate in silent mode, will notify the user by vibration, a blinking display, or other silent means. (*See, Pitts, [0047]*). If the call is answered, audible messages from the user are not transmitted; instead, the user must utilize the keypad, stored

messages retrieved in response to keypad entries, or other silent means of communications. (*See, Pitts, [0024], [0051]*).

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

The applied art of record does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the present invention. In particular, the cited Pitts reference does not disclose or suggest “enabling/disabling the transmission functions of said wireless transmission/reception section,” as required by independent Claims 1 and 3 or “transmitting a communication prohibition signal and/or a communication permission signal to the portable information apparatuses,” as required by independent Claims 7 and 11.

As noted above, the object of Pitts is to keep phones from ringing in public places which require silence, such as music halls. However, the transmission function of the portable communication device taught in Pitts is operated at all times. When the user is in certain environments such as a music hall, the user must utilize the keypad, stored messages retrieved in response to keypad entries, or other silent means of communications. (*See, Pitts, [0024], [0051]*). Accordingly, Pitts does not teach stopping transmission functions of electromagnetic waves.

In contrast, the present invention requires enabling/disabling of the transmission functions of the wireless transmission/reception section. This has the advantage of making it possible for the carrier to turn off only the transmission functions while maintaining information processing functions which enable the performance of certain operations such as viewing received information and preparing for e-mail without causing nuisance to the public on interference for electromagnetic sensitive devices such as pacemakers. (*See, Application, page 3, lines 11-19*).

Since the cited reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above features recited in amended independent Claims 1, 3, 7 and 11, these references cannot be said to anticipate nor render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of those claims.

Accordingly, amended independent Claims 1, 3, 7 and 11 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested. The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent Claims 1, 3, 7 and 11 and recite additional features of the invention which are neither disclosed nor fairly suggested by the applied references and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance. For example, with respect to dependent Claims 2 and 4, it is noted that those claims require "wherein said wireless transmission/reception section is adapted to serve as a dedicated wireless receiver when said transmission functions of said wireless transmission/reception section are disabled." As noted above, the Pitts reference teaches a portable communication device which stays on all the time and sends stored messages using keypads even when deactivated. Accordingly, the wireless transmission/reception of Pitts is not used as an dedicated wireless receiver. This requirement further distinguishes the present application over the Pitts reference.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6809 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.


Appl. No. 09/900,707
Amdt. Dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of 12/22/03

Attorney Docket No. 81876.0022
Customer No.: 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: March 12, 2004

By: 
Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701